

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are presently pending. Claims 1-17 are allowed. Assignee appreciates Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 18 is rejected.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Linzer in view of Witt. Claim 18 recites, among other limitations, "storing data in a machine readable memory device starting at a first address, wherein the machine readable memory device has a plurality of burst boundaries, and wherein the first address is offset from a particular one of the burst boundaries by a first number of bytes; storing the same data in the machine readable memory device a second time at a second address, wherein the second address is offset from another particular one of the burst boundaries by a second number of bytes, wherein the second number of bytes are different from the first number of bytes."

Examiner has indicated that Linzer discloses "storing data ... starting at a first address (page 1, [0007], lines 3-6) ... storing the same data ... a second time at a second address (page 4, [0040], lines 1-6)." Assignee respectfully traverses.

It is first noted that Linzer, page 1, [0007], lines 3-6, is part of the "Summary of the Invention", while page 4, [0040], lines 1-6 are part of the "Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments". Furthermore, page 4, [0040], lines 1-6 does not teach "storing the same data ... a second time at a second address". Rather, Linzer, page 4, [0040], lines 1-2 teaches that "A 2-cycle burst generally provides

a 2x8 region from one field". Assignee respectfully submits that discussion about "provides a 2x8 region from one field" is altogether different from "storing the same data ... a second time at a second address". Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 17.

Additionally, Examiner has indicated that "Witt in (fig. 1B) discloses a MODRM field that has a variety of formats. ... It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated method of Witt in the method of Linzer et al in order to offset the first address from a particular one of the burst boundaries by a first number of bytes and offset the second address from another particular one of the burst boundaries by a second number of bytes, wherein the second number of bytes are different from the first number of bytes. The motivation to utilize the method of Witt in the method of Linzer would be for faster processor (col. 6, lines 14-18)."

Assignee respectfully traverses and submits that the combination of Linzer and Witt do not teach "wherein the second address is offset from another particular one of the burst boundaries by a second number of bytes, wherein the second number of bytes are different from the first number of bytes".

It is first noted that although Witt teaches a "displacement ... field", Witt, Col. 4, Line 47, there is no teaching of "offset from another particular one of the burst boundaries by a second number of bytes". Additionally, Witt does not teach that "wherein the second

number of bytes are different from the first number of bytes". Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable.

Additionally, Assignee also traverses wherein Examiner has indicated that "The motivation to utilize the method of Witt in the method of Linzer would be for faster processor (col. 6, lines 14-18)." Col. 6, Lines 14-18 state "Alternatively, it has also been suggest that a superscalar X86 would have faster, RISC-like superscalar mode for the simpler instructions and would likely execute in hardware which follows recent advances in RISC processor design."

It is respectfully submitted that the term "faster" in "faster, RISC-like superscalar mode" is merely relative to "a superscalar X86" and thus would not motivate one skilled in the art to "utilize the method of Witt in the method of Linzer".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: April 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal  
Reg. No. 44,052  
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100